



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,576	03/11/2005	Northon Rodrigues	PU020393	7300
24498	7590	11/02/2007	EXAMINER	
THOMSON LICENSING LLC			HO, ANDY	
Two Independence Way			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Suite 200			2194	
PRINCETON, NJ 08540				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/02/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/527,576	RODRIGUES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Andy Ho	2194

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3,5-8 and 10-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3,5-8 and 10-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 8/20/2007.
2. Claims 1, 3, 5-8, and 10-14 have been examined and are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 8 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following terms lack antecedent basis:

- (i) said defined group – line 8 claim 8. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 5-8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Angal U.S Patent No. 6,298,378 in view of Goodrich U.S Patent No. 6,516,326.

As to claim 1, Angal teaches a method for prescribing a device notified in response to an event related to the operation of a data network (event listener being notified when events occurred from other entities in the network wherein such events include changes in state of network devices, lines 20-29 column 2, lines 48-64 column 4) and said event comprising the steps of:

defining said event pertaining to said operation of a data network, wherein said operation concerns the status of the data network or a device of said data network (defining filters, wherein such filters describe the types of events that the event listeners want to be notified of, types of events include changes in state of network devices, lines 20-29 column 2, lines 28-55 column 5, Fig. 4);

assigning a group consisting of a plurality of devices (lines 15-53 column 6) of said data network to said event (event subscriber is being associated with the filter, Fig. 4 and associated reading);

assigning a rule to said event, wherein said rule defines at least one condition for triggering a notification of said event to said assigned device (rules of the filter, Fig. 4; such rules defines conditional statements corresponding to events required by the event listener, lines 42-55 column 5), and

 said condition is to be activated when matched to a notification of the operation of said data network (determination is made whether an occurred event matches the

filter, if matched then the event listener would be notified of the occurred event, lines 28-55 column 5).

Angal teaches the system is implemented using a user interface, with the help from a topology service, which allows a network administrator to maintain the network devices including event communications among them (lines 4-30 column 4). However, Angal does not explicitly teach the use of a topology editor. Goodrich teaches a network system wherein network topology is implemented in a user interface, the Network Topology Editor, which is used by a user to interact with network devices (lines 30-47 column 16). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Angal reference to include the teachings of Goodrich reference because by using a topology editor, the system could allow a user to use simple operations such as drag and drop to interact with network devices as disclosed by Goodrich (lines 30-47 column 16).

As to claim 5, Angal as modified further teaches an event group is defined for assigning a second device to said event (S1 is defined for event listeners L1 and L2, Fig. 8A, lines 31-53 column 6). Note the discussion of claim 1 above for the reason of combining references relating to the use of a topology editor.

As to claim 6, Angal as modified further teaches said device and said second device of said event group are notified with an action provider when said condition is matched to said notification (S1 forwards filtered events to event listeners L1 and L2, Fig. 8A, lines 31-53 column 6).

As to claim 7, Angal as modified further teaches the notification is rendered in view of a severity option (the severity of the event, lines 1-3 column 5).

As to claim 8, Angal teaches a method of notifying a group of devices (lines 15-53 column 6) in response to an event related to the operation of a data network (event listener being notified when events occurred from other entities in the network wherein such events include changes in state of network devices, lines 20-29 column 2, lines 48-64 column 4) comprising the steps of:

receiving a notification (receives the event, line 34 column 5) related to the operation of the data network, wherein said operation is related to a status of the data network or a device of the data network (events occurred from other entities in the network wherein such events include changes in state of network devices, lines 20-29 column 2, lines 48-64 column 4);

comparing said notification to a condition of a rule (rules of the filter, Fig. 4; such rules defines conditional statements corresponding to events required by the event listener, lines 42-55 column 5);

notifying a defined group of devices (lines 15-53 column 6) associated with said event with an action provider (determination is made whether an occurred event matches the filter, if matched then the event listener would be notified of the occurred event, lines 28-55 column 5).

Angal teaches the system is implemented using a user interface, with the help from a topology service, which allows a network administrator to maintain the network devices including event communications among them (lines 4-30 column 4). However,

Angal does not explicitly teach the use of a topology editor. Goodrich teaches a network system wherein network topology is implemented in a user interface, the Network Topology Editor, which is used by a user to interact with network devices (lines 30-47 column 16). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Angal reference to include the teachings of Goodrich reference because by using a topology editor, the system could allow a user to use simple operations such as drag and drop to interact with network devices as disclosed by Goodrich (lines 30-47 column 16).

As to claims 11-12, they are methods claims of claims 5-6, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 5-6 above.

As to claim 13, Goodrich further teaches the topology editor operates with in view of consumer electronics enabled interoperability standard (systems with incompatible formats can be communicated with the others, lines 11-20 column 1). Note the discussion of claim 1 above for the reason of combining references relating to the use of a topology editor.

5. Claims 3, 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Angal in view of Goodrich, and further in view of Vining U.S Patent No. 7,152,075.

As to claim 3, Angal as modified further teaches transmitting SNMP trap in response to an activated rule (SNMP trap daemon, line 56 column 5 to line 14 column 6). However, Angal does not teach a SNMP manager. Vining teaches a network event

notification system wherein a SNMP manager is used to transmit SNMP trap in response to an activated rule (Fig. 1, lines 7-35 column 5). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Angal reference as modified by Goodrich to include the teachings of Vining reference because by using a SNMP manager, the event notification system could further process SNMP trap as disclosed by Vining (lines 7-35 column 5).

As to claim 10, it is a method claim of claim 3. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3 above.

As to claim 14, Angal as modified further teaches controlling the operation of said device in view of a second action provider (notifying filtered events to event listeners, lines 31-53 column 6; sending request, controlling devices, lines 52-57 column 3). However, Angal does not teach controlling an action manager. Vining teaches a network event notification system wherein an action manager such as a SNMP manager is used to transmit SNMP trap in response to an activated rule (Fig. 1, lines 7-35 column 5). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Angal reference as modified by Goodrich to include the teachings of Vining reference because by using an action manager such as a SNMP manager, the event notification system could further process SNMP trap as disclosed by Vining (lines 7-35 column 5).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 8/20/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that the cited references do not teach assigning a group of devices to an event (Remarks, last incomplete paragraph page 5 to second complete paragraph page 6). In response, the applicant argued a new limitation that was not claimed before. However, this new limitation is still met by a previous cited reference as disclosed in the claim rejections above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andy Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-3762.

A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (571) 273 - 8300.
- OFFICIAL faxes must be signed and sent to (571) 273 - 8300.
- NON OFFICIAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (571) 273 – 3762

A.H
October 26, 2007



WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100